

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JOEL STEDMAN and KAREN JOYCE, on  
behalf of themselves all others similarly situated,

Case No. C18-1254RSL

Plaintiff,

V.

## PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE CO.,

## ORDER DENYING MOTION TO SEAL

Defendant.

This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Under Seal.” Dkt. # 66.

Plaintiffs seek to seal excerpts of testimony and an exhibit on the ground that defense counsel designated the documents as confidential during discovery.

“There is a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files,” and, absent a showing that the public’s right of access is outweighed by the interests of the public and/or the parties in shielding the material from public view, a seal is not appropriate. LCR 5(g). A party’s unilateral designation of a document as confidential under a protective order does not, in and of itself, justify a seal under LCR 5(g)(2). Defendant did not file a response to the motion as required by LCR 5(g)(3) or otherwise show the legitimate private or public interests that warrant a seal, the injury that would result from public disclosure, or that the public’s right of access should give way.

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
TO SEAL - 1

1 Because the parties have not made the showing necessary to preclude public access to the  
2 documents at issue, plaintiffs' request for a seal is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to  
3 unseal Dkt. # 67.

4

5 Dated this 28th day of January, 2022.

6 Robert S. Lasnik

7 Robert S. Lasnik  
8 United States District Judge

27 ORDER DENYING MOTION  
28 TO SEAL - 2